UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,581	03/20/2006	Karl Ruhland	RUHLAND2	2874
	7590 06/23/201 D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER		
624 NINTH ST		DEXTER, CLARK F		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/572,581	RUHLAND ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Clark F. Dexter	3724
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 A 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-9 and 11-15 is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,8,9 and 13 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,11,12,14 and 15 is/are reject 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examina	e withdrawn from consideration. ed. or election requirement.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2009 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to a drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ne 37 CFR 1.85(a). Dijected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Pority documents have been receiv Nau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 19, 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 24, "the shell" remains vague as to which one.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/572,581

Art Unit: 3724

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 7, 11, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Publication 22 25 152 (hereafter GP '152) in view of any one or all of Boutelle, 1,539,826, Grace, pn 2,485,280, Crispell, pn 3,876,318, Miller, pn 4,397,484, Thummel et al., pn 5,299,375, and/or Brian, pn 5,997,012.

Regarding claims 1, 11, 14 and 15, GP '152 discloses a device with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a blade shaft (e.g., 1) which has at least one circular blade (e.g., 7), a brush roll (e.g., 9), the brush roll possessing shells (e.g., see Fig. 7) disposed on a roll core (e.g., 2, 10) and having bristles (e.g., 91, 92), torque-transmitting means and fastening means, **but lacks**:

[from claim 1] wherein fastening pin comprises two threaded portions of different pitches; and

[from claim 11] fastening means for fixing the basic structure to the roll core, wherein the fastening means is a fastening pin comprising two threaded portions of different pitches; and

receiving means as through holes comprising two threaded portions of different pitches for associating with the fastening pin;

[claim 14] wherein a first of the threaded portions of the fastening pin fitting inside the threaded hole on the shell, and a second of the threaded portions of the fastening pin fitting inside the threaded hole on the roll core, and the second threaded portion of the fastening pin has a larger pitch than the pitch of the first threaded portion of the fastening pin;

[claim 15 (from 14)] wherein the second threaded portion of the fastening pin is of a larger diameter than the first threaded portion of the fastening pin.

However, the Examiner maintains the taking of Official notice that such fastening means configurations including different pitch and size fasteners as well as receiving holes are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including adjustment benefits. Several examples of such configurations are provided to demonstrate that the claimed fastening means configuration is old and well known in the art as well as across various disciplines. It is noted that the Examiner is confident that many more examples can be found and provided. For example, Grace (e.g., see the paragraph bridging columns 2-3) and Miller each discloses an example of such a fastening means configuration to couple two structures together. Boutelle, Crispell and Brian each discloses an example of such a fastening means configuration to couple two

Art Unit: 3724

ends of a clamp together. Thummel (e.g., see Fig. 10) provides an example of the use of such fastening means and how widely known it is. Therefore, it is respectfully maintained that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a fastening means configuration such as those taught by the above described teaching references on the device of GP '152 to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

Regarding claim 7, GP '152 discloses a device with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including first and second fastening means.

In the alternative, if it is argued that there is no disclosure of such fastening means, the Examiner takes Official notice that such fastening means are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including further stabilizing assembled components. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such first and second fastening means as additional fastening means on the device of GP '152 to gain the well known benefits including that described above.

6. Claims 4, 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Publication 22 25 152 (hereafter GP '152) in view of Clark, pn 3,942,210 and/or Cherry, pn 2,360,826 and/or Parr, pn 3,405,751 and/or Heine, pn 4,661,031 and further in view of Sauer, pn 3,285,642.

The combination teaches a device with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but lacks annular ribs and corresponding ring grooves. However, such structure is old and well known in the art and provides known benefits including

Art Unit: 3724

facilitating non-rotationally connecting a shell to a core. Sauer discloses at least one of many known examples. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such rib and ring groove structure on the device of GP '152 to gain the well known benefits including that described above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed April 19, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Further, applicant's declaration filed on April 19, 2010 has been carefully considered but is not persuasive, particularly in view of the Examiner's previously held position and the newly cited evidence/prior art.

In general, applicant has provided several arguments, both in the response as well as in the declaration, as to how applicant's invention is different from and non-obvious over the prior art. However, the Examiner respectfully submits that regarding the claimed invention, the distinguishing feature comes down to the fastening means configuration (i.e., regarding claim 1 and the corresponding dependent claims). The Examiner respectfully maintains that to simply replace the fastening means of GP '152 with the claimed fastening means configuration, which has been demonstrated as old and well known, would be an obvious modification to one having ordinary skill in the art and that such a modification would be done to gain the well known benefits including those taught by the newly-cited teaching references.

Art Unit: 3724

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Clark F. Dexter/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724

cfd June 20, 2010